

DELEGATE MARION: Would this language also permit a person or corporation owning more than one piece of property to vote more than once?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: Yes, with husband and wife relationship, the husband could vote once and the wife could vote once while they both actually live elsewhere.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: Would it also permit persons owning extremely small parcels of land to vote? I have in mind something I remember seeing in one of the national news magazines ten or fifteen years ago where a relatively small plot of Texas land was divided into parcels about an inch square and each inch of that Texas land, on the theory that there might be oil underneath it, was sold, I think, for a dollar a plot. Many hundreds of thousands of people could become property owners on this kind of basis. Would this permit each one of those persons owning an inch square of land to vote in a municipal election?

DELEGATE WHITE: In my opinion, it would, but this would be determined by the value of property which was set by the local municipality. For example, they might set \$100 or \$50 of personal property or other property and based on this, it would be possible for a thousand people with a \$50 investment each, to vote in the local election. This is not directly to your question, but in a recent election in Ocean City, Maryland — and I am not attempting to pick on Ocean City as such—approximately 950 people voted in the municipal election and out of this group there were a certain number of corporations voting, about 850 non-residents and only 50 local residents. The impact on the 50 local residents meant their 50 votes were diluted practically to nothing.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: One more question. Delegate Weidemeyer asked you a question about Baltimore City. There is nothing in this Majority Report which would permit a non-resident property owner in Baltimore City in any instance to vote in a municipal election in Baltimore City since Baltimore City is treated as a county.

DELEGATE WHITE: Quite true, Baltimore City is excluded.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Marvin Smith.

DELEGATE M. SMITH: Mr. White, there has been reference made here to corporations. Is it your interpretation or the interpretation of the majority that extending the right to vote to non-residents owning taxable property would include stockholders in corporations?

DELEGATE WHITE: The answer to that is yes, Delegate Smith.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Smith.

DELEGATE M. SMITH: How far down does it go? Somebody happens to own a share of AT&T and AT&T has a little plant in a town, does that give them a right to vote?

DELEGATE WHITE: Oh, yes.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Chair recognizes Delegate Fox.

DELEGATE FOX: Delegate White, did I understand you to say in a recent Ocean City election only 50 residents of the town voted?

DELEGATE WHITE: I do not have the precise figures with me but I believe the chairman of our Committee has the precise vote. Roughly, it was about 950 or approximately 50 local residents, as I recall it.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Fox.

DELEGATE FOX: I would like very much to see those figures because I cannot believe only 50 residents in Ocean City voted at an election.

Let me say this. In regard to corporations, you do not really mean that this would allow every stockholder in a corporation to vote in Ocean City and places like that. They allow one vote for the corporation, do they not, no matter how much land they own?

DELEGATE WHITE: I understand corporations can cast more than one vote under certain conditions.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Fox.

DELEGATE FOX: What are the conditions? Do they not allow just one vote for the corporation, no matter how much land it owns?

DELEGATE WHITE: I think Delegate Cardin has done some research and may have an answer on that.